

SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN

CASE NO.: 2013AP2702-D

COMPLETE TITLE: In the Matter of Disciplinary Proceedings
Against Jerry R. Albert, Attorney at Law:

Office of Lawyer Regulation,
Complainant,
v.
Jerry R. Albert,
Respondent.

DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ALBERT

OPINION FILED: August 20, 2014

SUBMITTED ON BRIEFS:

ORAL ARGUMENT:

SOURCE OF APPEAL:

COURT:

COUNTY:

JUDGE:

JUSTICES:

CONCURRED:

DISSENTED:

NOT PARTICIPATING:

ATTORNEYS:

NOTICE

This opinion is subject to further editing and modification. The final version will appear in the bound volume of the official reports.

No. 2013AP2702-D

STATE OF WISCONSIN

:

IN SUPREME COURT

**In the Matter of Disciplinary Proceedings
Against Jerry R. Albert, Attorney at Law:**

Office of Lawyer Regulation,

Complainant,

v.

Jerry R. Albert,

Respondent.

FILED

AUG 20, 2014

Diane M. Fremgen
Clerk of Supreme Court

ATTORNEY disciplinary proceeding. *Attorney publicly reprimanded.*

¶1 PER CURIAM. This is a reciprocal discipline matter. On December 9, 2013, the Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) filed a complaint and motion pursuant to Supreme Court Rule (SCR) 22.22 requesting that this court publicly reprimand Attorney Jerry R. Albert as reciprocal discipline identical to that imposed by the Arizona Supreme Court.

¶2 Attorney Albert was admitted to practice law in Wisconsin in 1971. His Wisconsin law license is currently

suspended for failure to pay State Bar of Wisconsin dues. Attorney Albert is also admitted to practice law in Arizona.

¶3 The OLR's complaint noted that on June 25, 2013, the Arizona Supreme Court reprimanded Attorney Albert for knowingly making a false statement by omission when he failed to tell the court that a question he planned to ask during a criminal trial was redacted so as to make it appear that the defendant had contradicted herself on the material point, when in fact she had not. The Arizona Supreme Court found that this act violated ER 3.3(a) and 8.4(d) of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 42, Ariz.R.Sup.Ct. Attorney Albert admitted the allegation and agreed that a reprimand was appropriate.

¶4 Attorney Albert did not notify the OLR of the Arizona reprimand within 20 days of its effective date.

¶5 On February 18, 2014, Attorney Albert filed a response to the OLR's complaint and motion, in which he stated that he did not object to the imposition of discipline reciprocal to that imposed in Arizona.

¶6 Under SCR 22.22(3), in reciprocal discipline matters, this court shall impose the identical discipline unless one of the enumerated exceptions is shown. There is no indication that any of those exceptions apply in this case.

¶7 IT IS ORDERED that Jerry R. Albert is publicly reprimanded as discipline reciprocal to that imposed by the Arizona Supreme Court.

